

REMARKS

Claims 16, 18, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-15, 17, and 21-25 have been canceled. Claims 16, 18, 19, and 20 remain in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested. The Examiner's comments are shown in bold.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed ratios between L1 to L2 and L1 to L4 do not appear to be supported by the disclosure.

Claim 22 has been canceled.

Regarding Claim 20:

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner revisit the rejection of Claim 20. FIG. 7 and the last paragraph of page 8 specification page through the first paragraph of page 9 of the specification provide the necessary support for Claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 13, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Morris. . .

The Applicant has canceled Claims 13, 14, and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over E.P. pat. '284 to Ralston in view of Brown. . .

The Applicant has canceled Claim 13 and 17.

Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston and Brown. . .

The Applicant has canceled Claim 14.

Regarding Claim 20:

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner revisit the rejection of Claim 20. Claims 20 recites four specific distances and three specific ratios involving those distances. The distance ratios allow the second channel to smoothly move between the stowed and extended positions. Neither of the cited references teach or suggest these three ratios. Ralston discloses two simple pivoting legs, and Brown a multi-pivoting member. The designs of both Ralston and Brown are tailored to their specific operational purpose, and serve those purposes well. There would be no motivation to add the ratios of the present invention to these devices. Nor would the structure of the Ralston and Brown support the four distances and three ratios recited in Claim 20. Changing either Ralston or Brown in accordance with the distances and ratios of the present invention would render those device inoperable and therefore unsatisfactory for their intended purposes. Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.01 (no motivation or suggestion to modify), MPEP 2143.02 (no reasonable expectation of success), and MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 20 is unobvious over both Ralston and Brown, and should be allowable. Finally, the Applicant is unaware of any patent statute which allows a claim to be rejected on the basis of "obvious engineering expediency".

Claims 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston, Brown, and Morris. . .

The Applicant has canceled Claim 21.

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston, Morris, as applied to Claim 14 above, and further in view of Margolies.

The Applicant has canceled Claim 15.

Regarding Claim 16:

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner revisit the rejection of Claim 16.

Claim 16 has been narrowed to add the limitation:

said lock including a locking strap having a hooked end, said locking strap pivotally connected to said second channel, wherein said locking strap may be selectively attached to said first channel.

Margolies makes mention that "securing means may be employed to fix the outriggers in the extended position while in use". However, Margolies does not disclose or suggest any specific securing means, and certainly does not disclose or suggest the very specific locking strap that is recited in Claim 16 as amended. Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2143.03 (all claim limitations not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 16 is unobvious over the cited references, and should be allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has rewritten Claim 18 in independent form.

Claim 22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has canceled Claim 22.

Form PTO-948 was not included in the Office Action, therefore the Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Ted Masters Reg. 36,209
5121 Spicewood Dr.
Charlotte, NC 28227
(704) 545-0037